bill through Congress and the two men who would carry out the mandate of the Congress . . . the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior.

While waiting in the Oval Office of the White House with these dignitaries, I recalled the statement made by President Franklin D. Roosevelt by radio to the nation in this same Oval Office about a decade earlier. At that time, President Roosevelt proclaimed that one of the post-World War II goals of the United States would be to decolonize the various territories under colonial powers around the world. As a member of the U.S. Army at the time, and as a Chamorro, I was overjoyed and encouraged. For me, it was another good reason to serve in the military during that world conflict.

Although the signing of the Guam Organic Act at the White House took place five years after the end of World War II, I thought at the time that it was the beginning of the decolonization of Guam. Unfortunately, almost half a century after the signing of the Guam Organic Act, the Chamorros are still trying to set up an island government without the bounds or restraint of colonialism.

It is our hope that before another 50 years have passed since the signing of the Guam Organic Act, we would see the passage of the Guam Commonwealth Act, now before the U.S. Congress.

I took President Roosevelt's statement about decolonization as a promise to me. I surely hope that the decolonization of Guam would happen while I'm still around.

Si Yu'os Ma'ase'.

## 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KENDALL MEDICAL CENTER

### HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 6, 1998*

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of Kendall Medical Center, an institution which has been responsible for providing South Florida with the best medical care possible. The facility, which provides full-service, state of the art care in a wide variety of medical specialties and has nearly 100 doctors on staff, has been honored for three consecutive years as one of America's ''700 Top Hospitals'' and is currently ''Accredited with Commendation'' by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare organizations.

Among the 1,000 plus employees at Kendall Medical Center, I would like to honor the following thirteen individuals who have worked toward the evolution of Kendall Medical Center throughout the last 25 years: Teresita Beiro, Angela Carrodeguas, Rosa Cerulia, Marta Cortes, Rosa Crespo. Elizabeth Mirone, Jo An Plumlee, James Rosenzweig, Elizabeth Sollogub, Patricia Stiers, Nancy Tablada, Judith Williams and Victor Maya.

Victor, whom I have known for many years, has been with the hospital since its inception and has served as its Chief Executive Officer Center since 1987. It has been through his leadership, vision, and determination, combined with the efforts of his employees, which have led to the outstanding achievements of Kendall Medical Center.

On the date of its 25th anniversary, I extend my thanks and my congratulations to those 13 individuals who have dedicated their lives to a quarter of a century of continuous care. You have provided South Florida with an excellent medical facility.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 6, 1998*

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, On August 6, 1998, I was not present to vote on rollcall vote 403 because of a pressing family matter in my home State of Delaware. Had I been here, I would have voted ''no'' on the Doolittle substitute.

When we started this debate, there were many sound proposals on how to improve our current framework of campaign finance. However, only one of these proposals has emerged as a realistic approach to significantly improve our election system.

My opposition to this substitute does not reflect a negative opinion of the author's hard work or ideas, but rather my opinion that the Shays-Meehan bill is the best method for reform.

Reformers who want to see significant changes to our election system signed into law must rally around the one bill that has the best chance of passing—that bill is the Shays-Meehan substitute.

## DOMESTIC KAOLIN COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1998

### HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 6, 1998*

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce the ''Domestic Kaolin Competitiveness Act of 1998.'' This legislation will revise the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (The Jones Act) to ensure that laws meant to protect U.S. shipbuilding jobs will not hurt U.S. kaolin jobs.

Currently, the Jones Act requires all shipping between U.S. ports to be conducted exclusively by American built, owned, and crewed vessels. However, it does not apply to import/export shipments.

My legislation specifically targets the domestic shipping of kaolin, a fine clay found primarily in middle Georgia. Kaolin is used in a variety of industrial applications, such as producing the glossy finish on magazines, as well as the manufacture of porcelain products.

Currently, there are no American barges available that are suitable for shipping kaolin. Accordingly, Georgia clay producers are forced to use more expensive truck and rail transportation to supply American manufacturing customers, giving Brazilian kaolin producers a price edge in delivered costs. Mr. Speaker, when it is less expensive to transport kaolin from Brazil to Maine than it is from Georgia to Maine, something is not right.

This legislation would allow kaolin producers to request a waiver of the Jones Act, but only if there are no available American barges to transport the clay. In other words, if there are American barges available, clay producers would still be required to use them in order to ship by water, regardless of the price.

Mr. Speaker, this is a prime example of allowing federal regulations to strangle domestic industries, while granting de factor waivers to foreign competitors. It is also a case in point of the need for Congress to review past legislation to determine if it is still accomplishing the goals it was originally intended to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that the kaolin industry is put on equal footing and can compete fairly with its foreign competitors.

## DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

SPEECH OF

### HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, August 5, 1998*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kucinich amendment.

Some of my colleagues oppose this amendment because they believe it is a fig leaf for protectionist impulses. Others support the amendment because they believe it is necessary to preserve basic American values from encroachment by an evil international trade bureaucracy.

These attitudes are typical of the way we debate trade in this town. We choose up sides, either as ''free traders'' or as ''economic nationalists,'' and throw epithets.

But it's never that simple.

This amendment raises a legitimate issue. We visited this issue during negotiations on the World Trade Organization. A major impact of the creation of the WTO was that the United States, and all of the other members, lost what was in essence a veto power over decisions of WTO trade panels. At the time, we raised questions about the relationship between federal and state law in the context of our membership in this trade organization.

This amendment focuses on the impact of the WTO on state efforts. These are not simple issues with simple answers. They deserve our thorough and thoughtful consideration.

But an amendment to a funding bill does not provide an appropriate forum for this reasoned discussion. The implication of the amendment is that state laws affecting trade and international trade agreements are immune from action by federal authorities. While there has never been such federal action in the past, it is not wise—without very serious discussion—to immunize state laws, whatever their nature, from any such challenge in the future. Would our next step be to prohibit the use of federal funds to implement the decision of a WTO dispute settlement panel perceived to be adverse to federal laws? Doing so nullifies our prerogatives for involvement in trade organizations.

I took a lead position in trying to raise and resolve issues of interaction between WTO decisions and our federal and state laws when

the WTO was being negotiated. We made some progress in protecting the integrity of American law, particularly with regard to dumping. There still remain a number of gray areas, some of which this amendment sheds light upon. But these issues cannot be resolved by simply waving banners or invoking slogans, whether ''free trade'' or any other. They require and deserve much more than a clash of polarized debate.

## THE INTRODUCTION OF THE NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD HABITAT ENHANCEMENT ACT

### HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 6, 1998*

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the Neotropical Migratory Bird Habitat Enhancement Act.

This important conservation measure is modeled after the highly successful programs that Congress created to assist African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses, and tigers. In fact, I am hopeful that later this week the President will sign into law my bill, H.R. 39, to extend the African Elephant Conservation Act.

This legislation is very similar to the African Elephant Conservation Act, and I am confident that this small investment of Federal funds will provide the lifeline that neotropical migratory birds need to survive in the wild.

Neotropical birds, like bluebirds, robins, orioles, and goldfinches, travel across international borders and depend upon thousands of miles of suitable habitat. In fact, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, neotropical migratory birds typically spend five months of the year at Caribbean/Latin American wintering sites, four months in North American breeding areas, and three months traveling to these sites during spring and autumn migrations.

Sadly, there are 90 North American bird species that are listed as either threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act and an additional 124 birds that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has identified on its list of Migratory Nongame Birds of Management Concern.

In North America, an estimated 70 percent of prairie birds are declining. The Government of Mexico lists approximately 390 bird species as endangered, threatened, vulnerable, or rare. What is lacking, however, is a strategic plan for bird conservation, money for on-the-ground projects, public awareness, and any real coordination among the various nations where neotropical migratory birds reside.

While the full extent of the problems facing neotropical migratory birds is unclear, there is no debate over the fact that both bird populations and critical habitat declined significantly in the 1990's. We must act now before more of these species become endangered or extinct. This bill will contribute to the recovery and conservation of migratory birds, without violating private property rights.

There are 60 million adult Americans who enjoy watching and feeding birds at their homes. In fact, these activities generate some $20 billion in economic activity each year. In addition, healthy bird populations are an invaluable asset for farmers and timber interests. By consuming detrimental insects, these birds prevent the loss of millions of dollars each year.

Under the terms of this legislation, an individual or an organization would be able to submit a project proposal to the Secretary of the Interior. While the bill does not limit the type of projects, I would expect that efforts to determine the condition of neotropical migratory bird habitat, implement new or improved conservation plans, undertake population studies, educate the public, and reduce the destruction of essential habitat would be forthcoming. Since these birds migrate between the Caribbean, Latin America, and North America, comprehensive plans must be developed. It does little good if we are successful in conserving suitable habitat in only a portion of their range.

I am confident that a Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund would provide much-needed support for projects designed to conserve critical habitat for declining migratory bird species in an innovative and cost-effective way.

I urge my colleagues to support the Neotropical Migratory Bird Habitat Enhancement Act.

## THE ATLANTIC SWORDFISH MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT

### HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, August 6, 1998*

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, the effective management of Atlantic highly migratory species (HMS) and their fisheries is perhaps the most complex challenge facing the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) today. These species range widely throughout international waters and the jurisdictions of many coastal nations with diverse policies and perspectives on resource utilization and management. The fishing practices and marketing priorities for these species are equally diverse. Seriously compounding these challenges is that the biology of these species is not well known and remains difficult to determine.

Congress has recognized the unique and difficult challenges associated with effective conservation and management of HMS and those who fish for them. Fundamental to this recognition is that effective management of these species and fisheries cannot be achieved on a unilateral basis, but instead must be pursued on a multilateral basis throughout their range. Unlike most other U.S. fisheries, effective multilateral management is the goal of U.S. HMS policy. A number of specific provisions in both the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act) and the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act (ATCA) are intended to express this policy.

For example, Congress deliberately placed Atlantic HMS management authority in the hands of the Secretary of Commerce instead of the regional Councils for the purpose of ensuring that the U.S. maintained a multilateral, Atlantic-wide perspective and vision. As U.S. policy and law dictate, the principal purpose and obligation of domestic Atlantic HMS management measures is to faithfully implement and enforce the multilateral ICCAT measures. U.S. law requires such implementation to achieve but not exceed the conservation (fishing mortality) objectives of ICCAT measures and ensure that U.S. fishermen are provided a reasonable opportunity to harvest their allocation. U.S. law and common sense also dictate that domestic HMS management should avoid unnecessary regulatory burdens that serve to increase waste in the fisheries or disadvantage U.S. fishermen relative to their foreign competitors. These are some of the more important aspects of U.S. HMS policy.

As a matter of general fishery policy, section 303(b)(6) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act authorizes the Secretary to include a limited access system in any fishery management plan for any fishery, subject to certain considerations. The establishment of a limited access system is of critical importance in effectively managing fisheries for which U.S. harvesting capacity far exceeds the available resource—particularly if that resource requires rebuilding and is subject to quota reductions. Such is the case with our U.S. pelagic longline fisheries.

A limited access system also provides the opportunity to reduce harvesting capacity in such fisheries through attrition, a buy-back program, phase-out of latent permits, or other means. Such capacity reduction measures can facilitate the establishment of other important management tools designed to protect nursery and spawning areas and reduce bycatch while minimizing the economic consequences on the fishermen. Current Federal regulations provide that virtually any U.S. citizen who can pay a small administrative fee may enter the Atlantic swordfish fishery. This practice of allowing a continuous stream of new and inexperienced fishermen into this fishery has seriously hindered progress in achieving a number of key management objectives.

Although for many years the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline community has petitioned NMFS to establish a limited access system, the agency has repeatedly failed to move beyond endless deliberation and still has not put such a system into place. This delay has served to exacerbate the problems associated with this overcapitalized industry and has precluded consideration of some of the more important conservation needs facing pelagic longline fisheries. Meanwhile, NMFS has established limited access systems in other overcapitalized fisheries leaving the pelagic longline fishery open to fishermen displaced from these other closed fisheries. There are a large number of unused, latent permits in these fisheries and many new vessels have entered in recent years. The pelagic longline community and fisheries are in a state of emergency and can no longer wait for the agency to respond.

There are two purposes of the legislation I am introducing today. The first is to prevent any new fishing vessels from entering the U.S. Atlantic swordfish pelagic longline fishery by placing a moratorium on the issuance of any new fishing permits for vessels that did not hold a valid permit to fish in the U.S. Atlantic swordfish pelagic longline fishery on August 1, 1998. I would note that although this permit moratorium provision relates specifically to the Atlantic swordfish pelagic longline fishery, it is not intended to preclude or prejudice any possible future consideration of a similar moratorium with respect to other Atlantic swordfish fisheries including the drift gillnet and handgear fisheries.